

Disorder Induced Phase Transition in a Random Quantum Antiferromagnet

Anders W. Sandvik^(a) and Marco Vekić^(b)

Department of Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106

(February 1, 2008)

Abstract

A two-dimensional Heisenberg model with random antiferromagnetic nearest-neighbor exchange is studied using quantum Monte Carlo techniques. As the strength of the randomness is increased, the system undergoes a transition from an antiferromagnetically ordered ground state to a gapless disordered state. The finite-size scaling of the staggered structure factor and susceptibility is consistent with a dynamic exponent $z = 2$.

PACS numbers: 75.10.Nr, 75.10.Jm, 75.40.Cx, 75.40.Mg

The copper-oxygen layers of the parent compounds of the high- T_c superconductors are good physical realizations of the two-dimensional (2D) antiferromagnetic Heisenberg model [1]. Recently, significant progress has been made in the theory of clean 2D antiferromagnets with short-range interactions [2,3]. The nonlinear σ -model (nl σ m) in $2 + 1$ dimensions is believed to describe their long wavelength physics. Chakravarty *et al.* [2] concluded that the ground state of this field-theory can be either ordered or disordered, depending on the coupling constant g , which depends on the interactions and the magnitude of the spin. There is convincing numerical evidence that the $S = \frac{1}{2}$ Heisenberg model with nearest-neighbor interactions on a square lattice is on the ordered side of the phase diagram, with a sublattice magnetization $m \approx 0.3$ [4], which is close to the ordered moment observed in the cuprates [1].

The microscopic mechanism leading to the destruction of the antiferromagnetic long-range order upon doping the cuprates is still not understood. In particular, in spite of some experimental support [5,6], it is not clear whether the nl σ m indeed describes the phase transition, as the dopants are expected to induce strong randomness in the spin-spin interactions before the charge carriers become mobile [7]. It is therefore important to investigate how various types of quenched disorder affect the long-range order of the 2D Heisenberg model, and how the nl σ m description [2,3] is altered by randomness.

In this Letter we present quantum Monte Carlo results for the $S = \frac{1}{2}$ random exchange model

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} J_{ij} \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j, \quad (1)$$

where $\langle i,j \rangle$ is a pair of nearest-neighbor sites on a 2D square lattice. The couplings J_{ij} take two values, $J_{ij} = J(1 \pm \Delta)$, at random, with a probability p for $1 + \Delta$ and $1 - p$ for $1 - \Delta$. We consider only the case $\Delta < 1$, i.e. all couplings are antiferromagnetic and the system is non-frustrated. Although the hamiltonian (1) does not exactly represent the kind of disorder present in the cuprates, where one would expect light doping to cause random frustrated interactions [7] (corresponding to $\Delta > 1$), we expect it to be of relevance in gaining

understanding of the effects of randomness in quantum antiferromagnets. In 2D an order-disorder transition can only take place at zero temperature, where the critical behavior is governed by quantum fluctuations. The opportunity to numerically study a disorder-driven quantum phase transition is a further motivation for this work.

We study the behavior of the hamiltonian (1) in the (p, Δ) plane. For $\Delta \rightarrow 0$ the clean 2D Heisenberg model is recovered independently of p , and the system is hence ordered at $T = 0$. For $\Delta \rightarrow 1$ (but $\Delta \neq 1$) both limits $p \rightarrow 0$ and $p \rightarrow 1$ correspond to the 2D Heisenberg model with dilute bond-impurities. Thus the system should be ordered in these regimes as well. As p is increased from 0 there will be an increasing fraction of singlets forming at isolated strong bonds in a background of weakly coupled spins. We argue that at a lower critical concentration $p = p_{c1}$, this leads to an order-disorder transition, in analogy with order-disorder transitions due to singlet formation in clean quantum antiferromagnets, such as the 2-layer Heisenberg model [8] and various other dimerized models [9]. As p is increased further, there must be another transition to an ordered state at $p = p_{c2}$, as the strong bonds start to dominate and the weak bonds effectively become impurities in a background of strongly coupled spins. As Δ is lowered the tendency to singlet formation diminishes, and one would expect the range $[p_{c1}(\Delta), p_{c2}(\Delta)]$ to become smaller and eventually vanish at some $\Delta = \Delta_{min}$ [10]. Below we present numerical results supporting this picture, which is illustrated by the phase diagram outlined in Fig. 1. The solid circles at the phase boundary are results of our quantum Monte Carlo simulations, which are discussed below.

We have used a modification of Handscomb's quantum Monte Carlo technique [11,12], and averaged over 50-300 realizations of the random couplings in order to obtain results useful for extrapolation to the thermodynamic limit. We have studied systems of L^2 spins with periodic boundary conditions. In order to obtain ground state results for $L = 4-10$, we have carried out simulations at inverse temperatures $\beta = J/T$ as large as 128, which for these system sizes is enough for all calculated quantities to have saturated to their $T = 0$ value. A theorem by Lieb and Mattis [13] guarantees that the ground state of a finite system with an even number of spins is a singlet, as long as all couplings are antiferromagnetic. We have

therefore restricted the simulations to the subspace with zero magnetization ($\sum_i S_i^z = 0$). We have also studied lattices with $L = 32$ at higher temperatures. In these simulations Monte Carlo moves changing the total magnetization were included.

The sublattice magnetization m for a finite system can be defined according to

$$m^2 = 3S(\pi, \pi)/L^2, \quad (2)$$

where $S(\pi, \pi)$ is the staggered structure factor

$$S(\pi, \pi) = \frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{j,k} e^{i\vec{\pi} \cdot (\vec{r}_j - \vec{r}_k)} \langle S_j^z S_k^z \rangle. \quad (3)$$

For the clean 2D Heisenberg model, spin-wave theory gives the leading size dependence of m^2 as [15]

$$m^2(L) = m^2(\infty) + kL^{-1}. \quad (4)$$

In Fig. 2 we show results for m^2 at a strong-bond concentration $p = 1/4$ for system sizes $L = 4, 6, 8, 10$, and various values of the disorder strength Δ . An approximately linear dependence on $1/L$ is seen for $\Delta < 0.8$. We therefore fit straight lines to those points and extrapolate to obtain the sublattice magnetization for the infinite systems. For $\Delta = 0$ we obtain $m = 0.276 \pm 0.004$, which is slightly lower [14] than the spin-wave result $m = 0.303$ [15]. For $\Delta = 0.70$ the extrapolated m^2 is zero within statistical errors, and this should therefore be close to the critical disorder strength for $p = 1/4$. For $\Delta > \Delta_c$ the scaling with system size must change to $(1/L)^2$ for large L , as $S(\pi, \pi)$ saturates. We have also performed simulations at $p = 1/8$ and $p = 1/2$, and obtained $\Delta_c \approx 0.75$ and $\Delta_c \approx 0.80$, respectively. These points are shown as the solid circles in Fig. 1. The rest of the phase boundary is outlined schematically. The result for $\Delta_c(p = 1/2)$ indicates that the critical concentration p_{c2} as $\Delta \rightarrow 1$ is larger than the percolation threshold [10].

For a given p , with $p_{c1} < p < p_{c2}$, as $\Delta \rightarrow \Delta_c$ the spatial correlation length ξ_r diverges as $\delta^{-\nu}$, where $\delta = |\Delta - \Delta_c|$. The correlation length in imaginary time, ξ_τ , diverges as $\delta^{-z\nu}$, where z is the dynamic exponent [16]. With $\Delta > 0$ Lorentz-invariance is broken, and one

expects $z \neq 1$. The dynamic exponent can be determined by comparing the size-dependence of the staggered structure factor $S(\pi, \pi)$ and the staggered susceptibility $\chi(\pi, \pi)$. For a zero-temperature quantum phase transition the exponent η for the algebraic decay of the spatial correlation function $C(r)$ is defined by [17]

$$C(r) \rightarrow \frac{1}{r^{2-D+z+\eta}}, \quad r \rightarrow \infty, \quad (5)$$

where D is the spatial dimensionality. The staggered structure factor therefore diverges as $\delta^{-\nu(2-z-\eta)}$. The staggered susceptibility is given by

$$\chi(\pi, \pi) = \frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{j,k} e^{i\vec{\pi} \cdot (\vec{r}_j - \vec{r}_k)} \int_0^\beta d\tau \langle S_j^z(\tau) S_k^z(0) \rangle, \quad (6)$$

and diverges as $\delta^{-\nu(2-\eta)}$.

Finite-size scaling theory [18] gives the size dependence of $S(\pi, \pi)$ and $\chi(\pi, \pi)$ at the critical point:

$$S(\pi, \pi) \sim L^{2-z-\eta}, \quad (7a)$$

$$\chi(\pi, \pi) \sim L^{2-\eta}. \quad (7b)$$

Hence, if $S(\pi, \pi) \sim L^{\gamma_s}$ and $\chi(\pi, \pi) \sim L^{\gamma_\chi}$, the dynamic exponent is given by $z = \gamma_\chi - \gamma_s$. In Fig. 3, $\ln[S(\pi, \pi)]$ and $\ln[\chi(\pi, \pi)]$ are graphed versus $\ln(L)$ for two points which we estimate to be close to the phase boundary in the (p, Δ) -plane. Least-squares fits of straight lines give the slopes $\gamma_s = 1.01 \pm 0.01$, $\gamma_\chi = 2.88 \pm 0.09$ for $p = 1/4, \Delta = 0.7$ and $\gamma_s = 1.00 \pm 0.02$, $\gamma_\chi = 3.12 \pm 0.15$ for $p = 1/2, \Delta = 0.8$. Hence we have two independent estimates for the dynamic exponent; $z = 1.87 \pm 0.10$ and $z = 2.12 \pm 0.15$. The indicated errors are of course only statistical. There are also errors, which we believe smaller than the statistical ones, due to the points investigated not being exactly on the phase boundary.

The value of z has consequences for the behavior of the uniform susceptibility χ_u at the transition point. The hyperscaling theory developed by Fisher *et al.* gives [17]

$$\chi_u = \frac{\beta}{N} \sum_{i,j} \langle S_i^z S_j^z \rangle \sim \delta^{\nu(D-z)}. \quad (8)$$

Hence, depending on z , the uniform susceptibility diverges, remains finite or vanishes at the critical point. For “dirty bosons”, Fisher *et al.* argued that the total compressibility (which corresponds to χ_u) remains finite, and $z = D$ [17]. The spin model considered here can be mapped onto a hard-core bose system with particle-hole and $SU(2)$ symmetries. The additional symmetries might in principle change the universality class from the one of the systems considered in Ref. [17]. Our results for the dynamic exponent are, however, consistent with $z = 2 = D$. The results displayed in Figs. 2 and 3 indicate that η is close to -1 , which satisfies the bound $\eta < 0$ [17]. In principle, one can use finite-size scaling for $\Delta > \Delta_c$ to obtain the correlation length exponent ν . We do not presently have sufficient data for a precise estimate, but the bound $\nu \geq 2/D = 1$ [17,19] appears to be satisfied.

We have calculated the uniform susceptibility for $L = 32$ systems at temperatures $T/J = 0.2 - 1.0$. Results for $p = 1/2$ and various Δ are displayed in Fig. 4. The disorder clearly enhances the low-temperature susceptibility. In view of the fact that χ_u is non-zero at $T = 0$ for the clean 2D Heisenberg model, it is unlikely that the susceptibility of the random systems vanishes as $T \rightarrow 0$. According to Eq. (8), this implies that $z \geq 2$, consistent with the above estimates from finite-size scaling. If $z = 2$, χ_u approaches a constant as $T \rightarrow 0$ at $\Delta = \Delta_c$. In 1D, random exchange leads to a low-temperature divergence of the uniform susceptibility [21]. This is also predicted in higher dimensions for systems with longer-range interactions [22]. The natural interpretation of this behavior is that some of the spins are effectively isolated from the rest of the system due to their local environment of strongly coupled spins. One would expect this behavior in the disordered phase of the model considered here as well, but not on the phase boundary if indeed $z = 2$.

A non-zero $T = 0$ uniform susceptibility implies that the disordered phase is gapless. In order to further investigate the spectrum, we have calculated the imaginary-time correlation function $C(\tau) = 1/N \sum_i \langle S_i^z(\tau) S_i^z(0) \rangle$, and used the maximum entropy analytic continuation procedure [20] to obtain the real-time wave-vector integrated dynamic structure factor $S(\omega) = 1/N \sum_q S(q, \omega)$. We have calculated $S(\omega)$ for both clean and random systems. In addition, in order to test the method, we have studied the case where the strong bonds are

arranged in a regular staggered pattern such that every spin belongs to a pair connected by a strong bond ($p = 1/4$). In this case one expects a gap for Δ larger than a critical value. Fig. 5 shows low-temperature results for $L = 10$ systems. For the staggered and random cases $\Delta = 0.8$, and the ground states of the corresponding infinite systems are disordered. The staggered system exhibits a clear gap; $S(\omega)$ is a narrow peak centered at $\omega/J \approx 1 + \Delta$, corresponding to the energy required for a singlet-triplet excitation of a spin pair connected by a strong bond. For the clean system there is a broad maximum around $\omega/J \approx 2$, and a narrow peak close to $\omega = 0$. In the thermodynamic limit, long wavelength fluctuations of the order parameter lead to a δ -function peak at $\omega = 0$. This peak is here shifted to a non-zero energy by the small gap present in the finite system. For the random case the peak at $\omega = 0$ is due to localized, gapless excitations. There is also more weight at low energies than for the clean system, which we associate with excitations involving primarily the weak bonds.

It would clearly be interesting to study the properties of a random quantum antiferromagnet with a gap. Two coupled layers, each described by the hamiltonian (1), should have both gapped and gapless disordered phases, depending on p , Δ and the (non-random) inter-layer coupling. Work on this model is in progress.

We are grateful to M.P.A. Fisher for an enlightening discussion on scaling theory. We also thank H. Monien, D. Scalapino and N. Trivedi for helpful conversations. Most numerical results were obtained by severe abuse of a farm of HP-715 work stations at the ECE Department at UC Davis. We also acknowledge the Texas National Research Commission for an allocation of computer time through Grants RGFY9166 and RGFY9266. This work is supported by the Department of Energy under Grant No. DE-FG03-85ER45197 (A.W.S.) and the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMR92-06023 (M.V.).

REFERENCES

- ^(a) On leave from Department of Physics, Åbo Akademi University, Åbo, Finland.
- ^(b) Permanent address: Department of Physics, University of California, Davis, CA 95616
- [1] G. Aeppli *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 2052 (1989); J. M. Tranquada *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 4503 (1989); N. Pyka *et al.*, Z. Phys. B **82**, 177 (1991); S.M. Hayden *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 3622 (1991).
- [2] S. Chakravarty, B.I. Halperin, and D.R. Nelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1057 (1988); Phys. Rev. B **39**, 2344 (1989).
- [3] S. Sachdev and J. Ye, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2411 (1992); A. Chubukov and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 169 (1993).
- [4] J.D. Reger and A.P. Young, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 5987 (1988); M. Gross *et al.* Phys. Rev. B **39**, 2484 (1989); K. Runge, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 7229 (1992); U.J. Wiese and H.P. Ying Z. Phys. B **93**, 147 (1994).
- [5] T. Imai *et al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1002 (1993); **71**, 1254 (1993).
- [6] A. Sokol and D. Pines, Phys. Rev. Lett., **71**, 2813 (1993),
- [7] A. Aharony *et al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1330 (1988).
- [8] K. Hida, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **61**, 1013 (1992); A.J. Millis and H. Monien, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 2810 (1993); A.W. Sandvik and D.J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 2777 (1994).
- [9] N. Katoh and M. Imada, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **62**, 3728 (1993); S.R. White, R.M. Noack and D.J. Scalapino, preprint (1994).
- [10] Exactly at $\Delta = 1$ the system cannot be ordered for p smaller than the percolation threshold $p_p = \frac{1}{2}$. Quantum fluctuations may destroy the long-range order even for

- $p > p_p$. One would expect the critical probability $p_{c2}(\Delta \rightarrow 1)$ to coincide with the critical value of p at $\Delta = 1$.
- [11] A.W. Sandvik and J. Kurkijärvi, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 5950 (1991); A.W. Sandvik, J. Phys. A **25**, 3667 (1992).
 - [12] In this approach there are no $\Delta\tau$ errors of the type present in world-line methods; J. E. Hirsch *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **26**, 5033 (1982).
 - [13] E.H. Lieb and D.C. Mattis, J. Math. Phys. **3**, 749 (1962).
 - [14] The numerical values of m^2 for $L = 4 - 10$ agree well with Runge's Green's function Monte Carlo results (Ref. [4]). He included a quadratic term in the fit and obtained a slightly larger extrapolated magnetization.
 - [15] D.A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 2380 (1988).
 - [16] J.A. Hertz, Phys. Rev. B **14**, 1165 (1976).
 - [17] M.P.A. Fisher *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 546 (1989).
 - [18] See, for example, M.N. Barber, in *Phase transitions and critical phenomena, vol. 8.*, edited by C. Domb and J. Lebowitz (Academic, London, 1983).
 - [19] J.T. Chayes *et al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 2999 (1986).
 - [20] R.N. Silver, D.S. Sivia and J.E. Gubernatis, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 2380 (1990); M. Vekić and S.R. White, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 7643 (1993).
 - [21] S.K. Ma, C. Dasgupta, and C.K. Hu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 1434 (1979); S.R. Bondeson and Z.G. Soos, Phys. Rev. B **22**, 1793 (1980); J.E. Hirsch and J.V. José, Phys. Rev. B **22**, 5339 (1980).
 - [22] R.N. Bhatt and P.A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 344 (1982).

FIGURES

FIG. 1. Proposed phase diagram of the random exchange model (1) in the (p, Δ) -plane. The solid circles are Monte Carlo estimates of transition points between the antiferromagnetic (AF) and gapless disordered (GD) phases. The curve is a schematic outline of the rest of the phase boundary.

FIG. 2. The sublattice magnetization squared versus the inverse system size at a strong-bond concentration $p = 1/4$ and $\Delta = 0$ (solid circles), $\Delta = 0.5$ (open circles), $\Delta = 0.7$ (solid squares), $\Delta = 0.8$ (open squares), and $\Delta = 0.9$ (solid triangles). Where not shown, statistical errors are smaller than the size of the symbols. The dashed and solid lines are fits to the $\Delta = 0$ and $\Delta = 0.7$ data, respectively.

FIG. 3. Finite-size scaling of the staggered structure factor (open circles) and the staggered susceptibility (solid circles) for $p = 1/2, \Delta = 0.8$ (top) and $p = 1/4, \Delta = 0.7$ (bottom). The straight lines are least-squares fits to the points.

FIG. 4. The uniform spin susceptibility versus temperature for systems of size 32×32 , at a strong-bond concentration $p = 1/2$. Solid circles are for $\Delta = 0$, open circles for $\Delta = 0.5$, solid squares for $\Delta = 0.7$, open squares for $\Delta = 0.8$, and solid triangles for $\Delta = 0.9$.

FIG. 5. Wave-vector integrated dynamic structure factors for $L = 10$. The dashed curve is for a clean system at $\beta = 32$, the solid curve for a random system with $p = 1/4, \Delta = 0.8$ at $\beta = 64$, and the dotted curve for a staggered strong-bond pattern with $\Delta = 0.8$.